

# RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

COME NOW, AND LET US REASON TOGETHER.—ISAIAH 1. 18.

EDITED BY REV. R. CARRIQUE.—PUBLISHED BY AN ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN.

VOL. II.]

HARTFORD, (CONN.) OCTOBER 18, 1823.

[NO. 25.]

*From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.*

## ON THE DIFFICULTIES AND DISCOURAGEMENTS, WHICH ATTEND THE STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

*(Continued from page 165.)*

There are, you know, two clergymen\* of the town, who have studied themselves into heresy, or at least into a suspicion of it; both of them, men of fair, unblemished characters; one has all his life been cultivating piety, and virtue, and good learning. Rigidly constant himself in the public and private duties of religion; and always promoting in others virtue and such learning as he thought would conduce most to the honor of God, by manifesting the greatness and wisdom of his works. He has given the world sufficient proofs that he has not mispent his time, by very useful works of philosophy and mathematics; he has applied one to the explanation of the other, and endeavored by both to display the glory of the great Creator. And to his study of nature, he early joined the study of the scriptures; and his attempts, whatever the success be, were at least well meant; and, considering the difficulty of the subjects he has engaged in, it must be allowed that in the main they are well aimed; and, if he has not succeeded, no more have others who have meddled with the same subjects. Nor is he more to be blamed than they. To be blamed, did I say? I should have said, not less to be commended. For sure it is a commendable design, to explain scripture difficulties, and so remove the objections of profane men, by showing there is nothing in the sacred writings, but what is true and rational.

But what does a life, thus spent, avail? To what purpose so many watchful nights, and weary days?—So much piety and devotion? So much mortification and self-denial? Such a zeal to do good, and to be useful to the world? So many noble specimens of a great genius, and of a fine imagination? It is the poor man's misfortune (for poor he is, and like to be, not having the least preferment) to have a warm head, and to be very zealous in what he thinks the cause of God. He thinks prudence the worldly wisdom condemned by Christ and his apostles, and that it is gross prevarication and hypocrisy to conceal the discoveries he conceives he has made. This heat of temper betrays him into some indiscreet expressions and hasty assertions; designing to hurt nobody, he fancies nobody designs to hurt him; and is simple enough to expect the same favorable allowances will be made to him, that he sees made to those who write against him. As to his learning, it is his misfortune that he is not skilled enough in the learned languages to be a great critic in them, and yet seems not to be sensible of his deficiency in this respect. And what advantage is taken of this, that he has not less heat and more criticism? His learning is treated in that manner, that you would think he did not know the first elements of Greek; though, even in that, he is much superior to most of those who make so free with him; and you every day hear his performances run down as whimsies and chimeras, by men who never read them, and if

they did, could not understand them. Nor does this warmth of temper come off better; it is all over obstinacy, pride, and heretical pravity; a want of modesty and due deference to just authority; they, that speak most favorably, look upon him as crazed, and little better than a madman. As to the poor man's character; and, low as he is, they cannot be content to leave him quiet in his poverty; whereas, had he not been early possessed with a passionate love for the scripture, and philosophy; had he not thought it his duty above all things to promote the glory of God, and been persuaded that could no way be so well done as by the study of his word and works; it is more than probable he had, at this time, been orthodox; and then, instead of his present treatment, his faults would have been overlooked; the learning, he excels in, would have been extolled, and no defect would have been found in other parts of it. He would have been cried up as an ornament of the age, and no preferment would have been denied or envied him.

This you know to be the case with one of the new heretics; the other\* is so prudent in his conduct, that he comes under but a suspicion of favoring the same notions. How now is he treated? Prudence in him is as great a crime as the want of it in the other. The imprudent man is treated as a madman, and rank Arian; the prudent one is less a heretic, but more dangerous; *sobrius accessit ad errendam ecclesiam*; and therefore the greater alarm must be raised against him. And what has he done? Why, he has, with a great deal of pains, brought together, in the best manner he could, all the passages in the New-Testament relating to the doctrine of the trinity. And so far his work is what those, who come from him, should be pleased with, since he has brought the materials together to enable men to form a right judgment of the question in dispute; and has put into their hands, if he be in the wrong, the best weapons against himself. But he has interpreted some texts in a manner that is not liked; it is true, he has so; but not once, that I remember, has he given an interpretation that is purely of his own head. He brings great vouchers, and, if he errs, it is always in good company. This is his offence; he has maintained, with many others, particularly the late dean of St. Paul's, in opposition to Sabellianism, that the three persons of the trinity are three real distinct beings; and the belief of three really distinct beings perfectly equal he maintains with Dr. South to be tritheism; and, that there must therefore be a subordination.—Now whether this notion be right, or not; if he cannot escape ill treatment, give me leave to say, that, if your study should lead you into any opinion contrary to what is generally received, you can with no reason expect better quarter. He is a man, who has all the good qualities that can meet together to recommend him; he is possessed of all the parts of learning that are valuable in a clergyman, in a degree that few possess any single one; he has joined to a good skill in the three learned languages a great compass of the best philosophy and mathematics; as appears by his Latin works; and his English ones are such a proof of his own piety, and of his knowledge in divinity, and have done so much service to religion, as would make any other man, that was not under the suspicion of heresy, secure the friendship and esteem of all good churchmen, especially of the clergy.

\* Dr. Samuel Clarke and Professor Whiston.

\* Whiston.

\* Dr. Samuel Clarke.

And to all this piety and learning, and the good use that has been made of it, is added a temper happy beyond expression; a sweet, easy, modest, inoffensive, obliging behaviour adorns all his actions; and no passion, vanity, insolence, or ostentation, appear either in what he writes or says; and yet these faults are often incident to the best men, in the freedom of conversation, and in writing against impertinent and unreasonable adversaries, especially such as strike at the foundations of virtue and religion. This is the learning, this the temper of the man, whose study of the scriptures has betrayed him into a suspicion of some heretical opinions; and, because it has, he must be blacked and defamed; he must be worried out of the great and clear reputation he is possessed of; and he, that has so many shining qualities, must be insulted by every worthless wretch, as if he had as little learning and virtue as the lowest of those who are against him. What protection now can you promise yourself from your virtue, when a man of such a character cannot be safe in his good name? Whatever therefore you do, be orthodox; orthodoxy will cover a multitude of sins, but a cloud of virtues cannot cover the want of the minutest particle of orthodoxy.

It is expected, no matter how unreasonably, that a man should always adhere to the party he has once taken. It is the opinion of the world, that he is all his life bound by the subscriptions he made in his first years; as if a man were as wise at twenty-four, and knew as much of the scripture and antiquity, and could judge as well of them, as he can at fifty. And yet, if a man will be studying these things, he cannot be sure he shall continue a year together in the same sentiments; and, if he should not, he must either stifle his persuasion, against the dictates of his conscience, or be exposed to the worse treatment, to be called a renegade, a false brother, a heretic, or any thing that malice can suggest.

(To be continued.)

From the (Portland) Christian Intelligencer.

#### BEWARE OF HYPOCRITES.

It is no less instructive than amusing, to observe the pains taken by our orthodox neighbours to prejudice the public mind against the doctrine of Universal salvation. Instead of appealing "to the law and the testimony," they circulate ridiculous stories, ransack the dismal cells of State Prisons, and hunt up old hypocrites and villains, if perchance, they may find one in each State, professing universalism. If one such character can be found among all the detested scoundrels in the State, they clasp him in their arms, and holding him up to public notice, rush forward, raising a loud shout of triumph and rejoicing. The truth of these observations will appear evident to every candid reader, after having carefully perused the following story, from the "Concord (N. H.) Repository," as copied into the "Newburyport Herald." Some "pious man," probably the minister of the town, associated with a convict in the Prison, who, on his death-bed, acknowledged his hypocrisy in having professed, what he never believed; and the account is triumphantly published, as though it was an unanswerable refutation of "UNIVERSALISM."

#### EXTRACT.

"A convict at the State Prison in this town, who was a professed universalist, but a man of considerable discernment, was confined to a sick bed. While thus situated, a pious man was lead to converse with him on religious subjects and to inquire into the nature of his hope. He expressed on this occasion a firm belief in the doctrine of universal salvation, and unlimited confidence in the mercy and goodness of God. Opportunities were repeatedly embraced to bring the subject to the mind of the sick man, and arguments used in vain to shake the grounds of his belief—he constantly asserted his firm reliance on divine mercy, and his full belief that all men on leaving this world, will

be received into the arms of the Saviour. This confidence continued, and this hope appeared to sustain him under all his sufferings, till he was convinced that his case was dangerous, and there was little or no prospect of his recovery. He then began to exhibit marks of trouble and anxiety, and at the first convenient opportunity requested his faithful friend to read and pray with him. The friend expressed surprise, and enquired—Why this concern? Where is the ground of your hope? What has become of your belief in the doctrine of universal salvation? With a heart apparently torn with grief, and eyes suffused in tears, he exclaimed, Oh, it is good for nothing! It is vanity! A castle built in the air, and presenting no foundation on which to rest the soul in a trying hour? Did you ever believe in the doctrine of universal salvation? I must be candid now, was the reply—I never did! Amidst all my pretensions, I never had confidence in its truth. It may have served at times to stifle my conscience, and in scenes of wickedness to quiet my fears, but I never had a full belief that such a system would stand the final test. He continued anxious to attend to the bible, and to hear the prayers and pious counsel of his friend; but to the last moments of his life deprecated in the strongest terms the delusive and fatal error which he had formerly attempted to believe. Beware Universalist, and avoid the pangs which rent the breast of this your brother. Before it is too late, renounce the delusive hope which you now so fondly cherish. Embrace the heavenly truths of the Gospel, that you be not finally cast out where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

Having carefully and candidly perused this wonderful story, we were naturally led to estimate its value, admitting its truth; which we do not deny. It appears to embrace the following interesting particulars.

I. As the story was considered to be "a striking picture of Universalism," we were first led to inquire, whether the Convict ever was a Universalist. This we find, on retracing the account, was not pretended; but on the contrary, that he confessed on his death-bed that he never believed the doctrine. See the following. "Did you ever believe in the doctrine of universal salvation? I must be candid now, was the reply—I NEVER DID!! Amidst all my pretensions, I never had confidence in its truth." Now this language is explicit and we know the prisoner never was a universalist. All his pretensions to a belief in that doctrine were hypocritical. And we should ever remember that as the hypocrite never did believe universalism, it could not have been the cause of his being in the State Prison, unless his disbelieving it, made it influential over his conduct; and if that were the case, what kept his pious associate out of the same confinement? for he also disbelieved the doctrine.

II. As the Convict is held forth as a pattern worthy of imitation, for having "boldly deprecated" what "he never believed," we were desirous of ascertaining, whether he met with any essential change of sentiment. And to our surprise, on reading the story a second time, we find no such pretension. There is no intimation but that he had ever been, at heart, as orthodox as his pious friend; but had hypocritically professed a belief in Universalism. Being on a death-bed, he threw aside the mask of dissimulation, and appeared as he really was; a believer in orthodoxy. To be sure, "he continued anxious to attend to the bible, and to hear the prayers and pious counsel of his friend; but to the last moment deprecated the delusive and fatal error which he had formerly attempted to believe." But this is no more than all such pious people would do, in a like case, when constrained to confess themselves hypocrites, in having professed, what they never believed. As it is a *sine qua non* with calvinists, that a man shall renounce all confidence in universalism, to be considered as one of the elect, the Convict, it appears, complied with their conditions of salvation, acknowledged his past dissimulation, and was fellowshipped by his pious friends.

III. From the foregoing, it is most evident that, the nar-



rator of the above story, must have been totally blind or extremely hypocritical, in setting it forth as a picture of Universalism, and calling the Convict the "brother of Universalists," when there are but two characters portrayed in the picture; and these are, a pious Calvinist and a hypocritical Convict, neither of whom, ever believed in universal salvation. It has nothing to do with universalism, but to shew that, *such characters* "deprecate it as a delusive and fatal error." The story relates primarily to orthodoxy and hypocrisy. We might with equal propriety attempt to give a picture of the dangerous effects of Calvinism, and cite an instance, in which a villain, who had always professed that doctrine, was heard to declare on his death-bed, that he never believed in Calvinism, in his life. Should we thus commit ourselves, we should be considered pitifully weak, or contemptibly wicked.

IV. We are under obligations of gratitude to the editor and publisher of the "Concord Repository," for the assistance they have rendered us, in making probable calculations on the professors of universalism. If they are detected in great crimes, as is sometimes the case, we may presume they are of the same stamp with the above described Convict. Were they called to a death-bed, they would confess their dissimulation, and acknowledge they *never did believe* in universal salvation. The story agrees very well with the observations we have made on professors of the doctrine, for we have always found those who were less virtuous, to be less sincere and hearty in the profession of universalism; while the more upright and exemplary, are unwavering in their faith, tranquil and triumphant in the hour of death.

V. We lament that, in the publication of the above relation, the writer should have been so unhappy in making his application. So far from applying it to Universalists, of whom no description is given, he ought to have addressed himself to all his brethren in the faith of "the heavenly truths" of partial election, unconditional reprobation and eternal misery, for the glory of God and the good of the universe; and exhorted them not to profess universalism, when they were about to commit a crime which would expose them to the State Prison; lest they should, like their friend of similar faith, be compelled to acknowledge themselves hypocrites, as well as villains, and that they *never did believe* in universal salvation. We think the account in the Repository, would have appeared quite as well, if a word had been said to such orthodox dissemblers, on the impropriety of indulging in crimes, whose penalty is imprisonment in those dismal cells. It must have been far more consistent for the writer, to caution his own brethren against such iniquity and dissimulation, than to attempt to influence *real* universalists to renounce a doctrine in which they deal justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God, and embrace one which would probably conduct them to the villain's home, the State Prison. Should the *pious minister* of Concord, or any other man of like *temperate* habits, make another discovery, equally honorable to universalists, and just to their Calvinist opposers, we solicit the editor of the Repository to publish it without delay, as a terror to hypocrites, and a praise to them who profess what they soberly believe.

#### COMMUNICATIONS.

##### FOR THE INQUIRER.

The new translation, or improved version of the New Testament, appears to be a theme for general conversation, and often elicits severe remarks, particularly in the Baptist circles. That a *revision* of the common version is much needed, I think every candid mind will admit, after a careful examination. It needs but a moderate share of common sense, and general information, to perceive, that if any book contains palpable contradictions, and evident disagreement of parts, it cannot be the production of a perfect

being; and, *as such*, cannot claim undivided approbation. Let us now look at a few of those passages in our common version, which require but little learning to examine, and of which to form a judgment with as much certainty as on any other simple proposition.

Mat. xxvi. 45, 46. "Then cometh he to his disciples, and saith unto them, sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me."

The incongruity of these verses, consists in bidding his disciples to *watch*, in the context, and now, in his *extremity*, to say, "*sleep on*," and to follow this by the order—"Rise, let us be going."

Mark is translated similar to Matthew in this particular. Luke xxii. 46, relating the same circumstance, is thus translated:—"Why sleep ye? rise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation."

Every person, not predetermined to close his eyes on the light of evidence, must discern the inconsistency of the translations from Matthew and Mark with the plain sense of the context, and with the version of the same circumstance by Luke. And no man who is of sound mind, will hesitate a moment in the choice of these versions.

In the version of Mat. xxvii. 5, we read of Judas—"he went and hanged himself."

In Acts i. 18, we read of Judas, that "he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." Can both these versions claim our belief?

In 2 Tim. iii. 16, we read—"All scripture is given by inspiration of God." Is this fact? We certainly read what we are assured on the face of it, is not by inspiration, and he must know little of the Bible who has not discovered the *reverse* of this translation to be true.

But, if we refer to *facts*, it is easy to determine, that the outcry respecting Mr. Kneeland's improved version, signifies nothing. In a late work, approved by the Baptist convention, other versions are accepted in preference to the common, as the following quotations abundantly show:

"You may not be acquainted with the fact, my friend, that the words *baptize* and *baptism* are Greek words with an English ending. But this is the *fact*. Why these words were retained, rather than translated, when the ordinance of Christ is in view, we know not. That they are capable of a fair translation is evident, because our translators have translated the words where the ordinance was not intended. See 2 Kings v. 14.

"From this UNFAIR MANAGEMENT, the unlettered reader is subjected to the fatigues of a long controversy, which a fair translation would have prevented.

"Jesus Christ said, 'I have a baptism to be baptized with,' meaning the sufferings he was to endure. He was to be overwhelmed with sufferings. Dr. Campbell has justly rendered the passage, 'I have an *immersion* to undergo.' Dr. Doddridge paraphrases the words, 'I know I shall shortly be *plunged* in the most overwhelming distress.'

More, to the same purport, could easily be transcribed, but the above is surely sufficient to show, that the Baptists are by no means unfriendly to improvements in our version, unless they militate against the *darling tenet of never ending misery*. Do they not charge the translators with *unfair management*, in the mere matter of baptism? and is it a crime for us to show, by *demonstration*, that the Greek text has been *tortured*, for certain purposes, in the Septuagint translation?

But, we may inquire, why are so many translations now extant—and why has every commentator noticed *imperfections*, if the desired object were obtained in any one extant? And why have some of the brightest ornaments of literature taken unwearied labour, and some of them spent

a common life time in comparing manuscripts, and making valuable discoveries, unless former translations were defective?

But to what cause are we to look for *insuperable* objections to a new version? Are the different editions of the common version uniform? Certainly not. In *one* verse, four different editions have *as many* various readings. They are not, however material. In an edition stereotyped by D. & G. Bruce, New-York, for Wm. E. Norman, Hudson, in the 17th of John, and 12th verse, may be found "this son of perdition," differing from every other ever noticed by the writer, by the substitution of *this* for *the*. Trifling as this alteration may appear, it is a very important one, and calls for severe animadversion, and immediate correction. I would by no means impute this error to any improper motive in the type foundry, with whom I am acquainted, but that it so happened through *design* in *some* one, I have good reason to believe. The plates are now owned by the Messrs. Hosford's, Albany.

Those who are accustomed to examine large Bibles must have noticed *marginal* readings, in the *italic* character, which show, either how the passages to which they relate *might* be rendered, or what was considered the *sense* of the text, the version of which might appear obscure. As far as these readings throw any light on the subject, they are valuable in family Bibles, while in the small editions they are omitted, and the reader is left to grope his way in the dark. In the quarto editions cast by the Messrs. Collins, New-York, some of these marginal readings are omitted; *one*, certainly, which is important. How far this omission is to be *justified*, and what may have been the *intention*, is for those to judge, who feel the value of the subject.

Have the translators been *very careful* not to add to, nor alter, the sense of the original? No. The abundance of substituted words and sentences in *italic* characters, indicate their willingness in some cases, to *mislead* by their additions. It is true, these substituted words sometimes preserve the sense, while at other times they *pervert*, if not totally blind the true meaning of certain texts, when examined with their context. Is the mass, even of professing christians aware of this fact? if not, why keep them longer in the dark?

Add to this, the vitiated punctuation, and the arbitrary, and unaccountably absurd division of chapters and verses, and I trust "the case is made out," that an improvement in the common version is necessary.

Of the version of Mr. Kneeland, I can give no opinion, never having seen it. I know the author to be a man of great research, indefatigable industry, and unwearied patience; and if he has undertaken the work without a large share of Biblical information, and a critical understanding of the Greek, I am much in the dark respecting his qualifications.

If, however, contrary to every idea of probability, his work bears the stamp of *ignorance*, or *sectarian zeal*, or *unfairness*; or violates the *consistency* of scripture, or in any way encourages a vicious understanding; or militates against the *acknowledged principles* of Deity, a host of eagle-eyed clergy are ready to show it from the *work* which is easily obtained, and it is hoped they *will obtain*, and *EXAMINE* it thoroughly, before they *denounce* it in a public discourse, as has lately been done in this city by one of the fraternity.

Not wishing to fatigue the patience of the readers, I close with the brief remark, that TRUTH like beauty, needs not the foreign aid of ornament, nor need it fear the closest scrutiny, for like gold, the more it is assayed, the brighter will be its splendour.

Reader—do you wish for the promulgation of truth?—then encourage free inquiry. "Prove all things—hold fast that which is good." That this birds-eye sketch of some

of the most apparent reasons for a revival of the translation alluded to, may lead to investigation, and that investigation to a knowledge of the scriptures commensurate with the extent of their distribution, is the sincere prayer of your friend,

A BIBLE CHRISTIAN.

FOR THE INQUIRER.

#### MISSIONARIES IN INDIA.

The missionaries in their reports and accounts concerning the natives of the East, and their exertions and wonderful success in Christianizing them, have uniformly represented them, not only as sunk into the grossest state of idolatry, but as stupid and ignorant in such a degree as to be scarcely elevated above the condition of the brutes that perish. The same frightful picture too, has been exhibited of their vices, the miserable fruits of such stupidity and ignorance. In general no particular exception, is made in favor of any *cast*, or class, but all are exhibited in the same deplorable condition of sin and misery, of ignorance and wretchedness. That a nation whose antiquity reaches far beyond the first dawning light of authentic history, and which for several thousand years have possessed a language, government, and laws, and a system of religion, if religion it can be called, so artificial, abstract, metaphysical and recondite as to have almost produced an artificial creation, and also possessing what may be called a national literature, ingrafted on that system, should be in a state of semi-barbarian ignorance would be a phenomenon in human nature. But to rouse and keep alive the missionary spirit, it seems to be thought necessary that the whole population not excepting any of the *casts*, or even individuals should be represented as in a state of the most profound ignorance stupidity and wretchedness; for if it was generally known that the higher casts were civilized and educated, that many individuals were men of profound learning and science, capable of engaging the missionaries in discussions as to the dogmas of the religion they teach as christianity, which have required all their talents and learning, and led some of the more candid to admit, that they could not defend the dogmas of christianity (meaning calvinism) against the attacks of the learned natives, it could not fail of having the most unfavourable impression at home on the missionary cause. And so cautious have the missionaries been in concealing the controversies in which they have been involved with the learned natives, that in general it is not known that such a thing has ever happened, and many no doubt would be as much surprised at learning the fact as they would to hear, that our missionaries at home were engaged in a controversy with the Aborigines of this country concerning the most abstruse points of theology.

Whilst the missionaries in their reports and communications, have detailed the minutest particulars as to their success, even the conversion of an orphan child, and whilst they enlarge on the difficulties they have to encounter, arising from the prejudices and superstition of the people, they studiously avoid noticing the controversies and disputes in which they are involved.

There has been some account in the Inquirer, of the long controversy which the missionaries have had with the learned native, RAMMOHUN ROY, which originated in consequence of his publishing in the Bengalee language a work entitled the "Precepts of Jesus," consisting of the moral maxims and precepts of the New Testament. This gave great offence to the missionaries, being calculated as they said, to do great injury to the cause of christianity, by separating its moral doctrines from its faith and dogmas. It was accordingly attacked by the missionaries, which called forth a reply from the author, entitled, "A Defence of the Precepts of Jesus." The missionaries rejoined to this, and ROY has since published a *second*, and the last information on the subject, was preparing the *third* defence of his original work. RAMMOHUN ROY, is



a philosopher and a man of extensive learning; he has embraced christianity, that is he believes in the unity of God, and the utility, efficacy and excellency of the moral doctrines taught by Christ, and attempts to inculcate them among his countrymen. He also believes that the attempt by the missionaries to teach the mysticisms and dogmas of the christian religion, or rather of what is called christianity, forms an insuperable obstacle to the success of their exertions.

The missionaries have been involved in another very serious controversy with the natives, conducted through the medium of the "Friend of India" a missionary periodical work, and a Braminical Magazine, published by the natives. We will make some extracts from this last publication, which may afford some light as to the nature of this controversy, and at the same time, present strong testimony as to the talents and attainments of some of the 'poor heathen,' whom the missionaries have undertaken to enlighten. In the second number of the Braminical Magazine, a writer proposes five questions, on the subject of the Trinity, with a request that they might be answered. He remarks, that,

"They (the missionaries) call Jesus Christ the son of God, and the very God. How can the Son be the very Father?"

"They sometimes call Jesus Christ the son of man, and yet say no man was his Father."

"They say that God is one, and yet say that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God."

"They say that God must be worshipped in spirit, and yet they worship Jesus Christ as very God, although he is possessed of a material body."

"They say that the Son is of the same essence and existence as the Father, and they also say that the Son is equal to the Father. But how can equality subsist except between objects possessed of different essences and existences?"

An attempt was made to answer these difficulties in the missionary work referred to, but in the English language only, although, as the native remarks, the controversy was intended for the benefit of the Hindoo community. The Hindoo writer, after expressing his disappointment that the answer of the missionaries should not have been in the Bengalee as well as the English language, replies to this answer in the third number of the native Magazine. This reply is in the English and Bengalee languages, and occupies twenty-four pages of each printed opposite each other.

We subjoin some extracts from this reply, which will sufficiently evince the ability and acuteness with which so abstruse and to a Hindoo, so novel a subject, is discussed.

"It is believed by all religious sects, that when God reveals his will or law to the human race, he reveals them through their language in its common acceptation. I beg therefore of the editor to favour me with a direct reply to the following question. Do the missionary gentlemen take the word 'God' as a proper name, or as a common one? all nouns being divided into two kinds, common and proper. In the former case, that is, if they consider the term God appropriated to one individual existence, as every other proper name is, they must relinquish the idea of the Son of God being the very God. How can we think the son of John or James to be John or James, or coeval with John or James? And in the latter case, that is, if they receive the term God as a common name, they may maintain the opinion that the Son of God is God, in the same way as the Son of a man is man, which, as the editor says, 'must necessarily be the case;' but they, in this case, cannot be justified in possessing a belief in the equal duration of the Son with the Father; for, *every son, whatever may be his nature, must have existence originating subsequently to that of his father.* The only difference between these two common nouns, *God* and *man*, would be, that the latter includes a great many individuals under it, and the former only three distinct persons, though of superior pow-

er and nature. We see individuals, under one term of *mankind*, though they are distinct in person, yet one in nature, as being all men. In like manner, three beings under one Godhead, according to the editor, though they are distinct in person, are yet, I infer, considered by him one in nature as Gods; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Is this the *unity* of God which the editor professes? Can this doctrine justify him in ridiculing Hindoo polytheism; because many of them say that under one Godhead there are more than three beings, distinct in person, but one in nature?"

On the third question the Bramun makes the following among other remarks:

"But instead of showing the reasonableness of the idea of three distinct Gods being one God, as applied for, he confesses the total inconsistency of this doctrine with reason, and makes the Bible responsible for it, saying, 'But the Bible, while it fully reveals these facts, still forbears to inform us how the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, exist, and form the triune God;' and adds, 'nor had it informed, are we certain that we should have comprehended it.' The editor, or his colleagues, ought to have taken into consideration such unreasonableness attaching to the most important of all their doctrines, before they had published in the Sumachar Durpun the letter accusing the Vedant, and the rest of the Hindoo Shastrus, of the want of reason; a circumstance which might have saved the editor the reluctant avowal of the unreasonableness of the foundation of his own system of faith."

"Is it possible even to conceive for a moment the identity between three beings, one of them in heaven, expressing his pleasure at the conduct of the second, who at the same time on the earth was performing religious rites, and the third of them then residing between heaven and earth, descending on the second at the will of the first? If the difference of bodies and situations, as well as of actions and employments be not sufficient to set aside the idea of the identity and real unity of persons, there would be no means of distinguishing one person from another, and no criterion would be left for considering a tree different from a rock, or a bird from a man. Is this the doctrine which the editor ascribes to God? and can any book, which contains an idea that defies the use of the senses, be considered worthy to be ascribed to that Being, who has endued the human race with senses and understanding for their use and guidance?"

"God the Son is declared by the editor to have *laid aside his glory* for a season, and to have prayed his Father to give him the same glory, and also to have taken the form of a servant. *Is it consistent with the nature of the immutable God to lay aside any part of his condition, and pray for it again?* Is it conformable to the nature of the Supreme Ruler of the universe to take the form of a servant, though only for a season? Is this the true idea of God, which the editor maintains? I shall be obliged if the editor can show that the polytheistical doctrines, maintained by Hindoos, are in any degree more unreasonable than his own. If not, he will not, I trust, endeavour in future to introduce among them one set of polytheistical sentiments as a substitute for another set; *both of them being equally and solely protected by the shield of mystery.*"

We should be pleased to make more ample extracts from this ingenious and acute discussion, would our limits admit; we cannot, however, forbear copying one paragraph more, as tending to shew the dreadful fallacy of the prevailing opinion which regards the Hindoos as semi-savages, involved not only in the darkness of superstition, but in the most profound ignorance.

"I cannot help feeling compassion for his total want of knowledge of the literary employment, and domestic conduct of the native community at large, notwithstanding his long residence in India. During only a few years past, *hundreds of works* on different subjects, such as Theology,

Law, Logic, Grammar, and Astronomy, have been written *by the natives of Bengal alone*. I do not wonder that they have not reached the knowledge of the editor, who, in common with almost all his colleagues, has shut his eyes against any thing that might do the smallest credit to the natives."

Thus it appears that the poor ignorant and deluded Hindoos, who are to learn religion, morals and civilization from a few missionaries, have a national press, and a national literature; that in Bengal alone, *within a few years past, HUNDREDS OF WORKS have been published on the subjects of Theology, Law, Logic, Grammar, Astronomy, &c.*

What can be more *chimerical* than to suppose that civil and religious institutions, which claim an antiquity of forty thousand years, which, are inseparably interwoven together, and also with the manners and customs of the people; and which are supported by, and form the basis of an immense superstructure of science, factitious, subtle and fallacious, but which still has the influence, that all learning must have, that of fortifying and strengthening any system to which it is applied, can be overturned by the efforts of a few missionaries? It might as well be supposed that the feeble taper's blaze could chase away the darkness of midnight, and fill the whole earth with that effulgence which the sun itself can only afford when at the meridian of its splendour.

## RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

SATURDAY, October 18, 1823.

### A SHORT SERMON.

"*The son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.*" Christ.

1. By the son of man, Christ alluded to himself. This being granted, the second inquiry is, what is that, which was lost. As but few words are allowed us in this discourse, we say men are alluded to as that which was lost. Now as divines are extremely anxious, when sin or misery is spoken of as the lot of man by reason of transgression, to include all men in the difficulty, (although they do not show this anxiety when deliverance or salvation is spoken of.) I will grant that all mankind are the lost spoken of in the text, which is a sentiment supported by the testimony of a no less prophet than Isaiah who hath said "all we like sheep have gone astray, and turned every one to his own way."

The text intimates that the thing lost possessed not the power to recover itself, or to save itself from its lost state. Hence the necessity of the son of man coming to seek and to save that which was lost.

If the thing lost possessed not the power to save itself; if it is ever found or recovered, it must be by some being or power other than itself, consequently the salvation of that which was lost is not dependent in any way on the thing lost, because that possesses no power in itself, but on the faithfulness of him who came to save.

It follows then as a matter of course, that as the salvation of that which was lost depends on the faithfulness of him who came to save, if any are left in their lost state, it is owing to the unfaithfulness of him who came to save, who hath not diligently searched until he had found that which was lost, and on finding saved it.

The text lays the all important work of *seeking and saving* on the shoulders of the son of man (Christ.) If the savior was correct in declaring the purposes for which he came into the world, the work of the redeemer has been most strangely misunderstood, for of late years, that which was lost is set to work to find the saviour, and is informed that unless it finds him, it can never be saved. This is not only completely reversing the order of the text, but rob-

bing the good shepherd of the glory and honor of performing the purposes for which he came into the world.

Is it the sheep which have strayed from the shepherd, or the shepherd which have strayed from the sheep? If it is the shepherd that is lost, then it may be necessary for the sheep, to hunt him up; but if the sheep are lost, then it will be necessary for the shepherd to seek the lost sheep until he find them, and when he hath found to return them to the fold.

As Christ has informed us what he came to do, there can be no question on our minds relative to his mission. He came to seek and to save that which was lost, not a part of that which was lost, but the whole. The only question with us is, will he accomplish what he came to do? Will he be faithful, or unfaithful? In answer to the above, we notice the words of Paul to the Hebrews. "Wherefore in all things it behoved to be made in all things like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Jesus then being a faithful high priest will "do all things well" which he came to accomplish, he will seek the lost sheep until he find them and in divine mercy will bring them home, that they may enjoy the salvation of God.

Reader, do you believe the testimony of Christ, or are you blinded by the traditions of men. It is for you to honor your redeemer by acknowledging that he was faithful to the trust which God has reposed in him, and thus believe that he will accomplish the work for which God sent him. Or, you must dishonor him by charging him with unfaithfulness, or a want of ability to accomplish all that he came to do, and thus believe that some men will be lost forever. Choose ye which ye will be, followers of Christ, in trusting in him, or denying the divine record, follow Calvin, Arminian or whom ye please, but do not call yourselves while thus doing, the followers of Christ.

"ATTLEBOROUGH, OCT. 3d, 1823.

Dear Sir, and Brother,

As it seems proper that some notice should be taken of the despicable means which the enemies of Universalism use, to overthrow the doctrine, I submit to your view the following story, which was told a few evenings since at the Arnold School House, by a young minister of the Methodist connexion, by the name of *Sunderland*. He stated that he was once acquainted with a Universalist minister, who lived in a town where there was a Gospel Minister, (as he termed him.) The Universalist often conversed on the subject of religion, and often expressed his faith in the doctrine of Universalism, but the Gospel Minister would as often tell him that Universalism would not do to die by, and so it proved, for the Universalist was taken sick, and being under an apprehension that he should die, sent for the Gospel Minister and told him, that he had strong doubts of the doctrine which he had been preaching, and requested him to pray to God, for him. Thus ends the story. This young man was asked after the service was ended, who the Universalist minister was, to whom he alluded, and he said it was Mr. Carrique.

R. KILLAM."

### REPLY.

The several statements in the above story are without foundation. In the first place Mr. Sunderland may have been so far acquainted with the editor of this paper, as to know him by sight, and may have heard him preach, but that the editor ever was personally acquainted with Mr. S. he has not the least recollection, and would not know him were he to meet him, from any other man whom he had never seen.

With respect to an acquaintance and conversation with a "Gospel Minister" on the subject of faith or doctrine, this



statement is untrue, as I have never been favored with an acquaintance with any "Gospel Minister" of any denomination whatever, but those with whom I am connected, that would lead to a friendly discussion of those topics. Although I have spent nearly eighteen years of my life in preaching the doctrine of Universal Salvation, and have ever been desirous of living on terms of friendly intercourse with those gentlemen in the ministry who differed with me in religious sentiments, this privilege has generally been denied me. With some clergymen it is true I have been able to pass the common compliments of the day, and occasionally, but very rarely, to enter into conversation on general topics, while the subject of religion has been studiously avoided. Having no wish to continue in an error, if I am unfortunately in an error, I have ever been disposed to cultivate a social friendly intercourse with those engaged in the ministry, that I might profit by their experience and researches, but as before noticed I have never enjoyed this privilege. While with some I could pass the compliments of the day, others have persevered in the sullen Orthodox determination not to know me, and even to deprive themselves of social and friendly enjoyment if it was known that I should make one of the party. Mr. S. ought to have given the name of the "Gospel Minister" with whom I have had these friendly conversations on the subject of my faith and hope. This he could have done, as he says he was acquainted with all the circumstances noticed. He does not mention these things as a hear say story, but as circumstances with which he is personally acquainted. I am sorry to be obliged to lay this falsehood on Mr. S.'s shoulders, but justice to myself demands, that he should reap the reward of his wickedness, and if he would hold any claim to the title of a 'Gospel Minister' I call upon him to repent of this sin, and confess to them to whom he has told this falsehood.

In regard to this stale and foolishly absurd declaration, that *Universalism will do to live by, but not to die by*, I believe I can say, and by experience too, that it is false. It has often pleased God in the dispensations of his providence to lay me on the bed of sickness; often have I day after day experienced the most excruciating pains; more than once has it been expected that I should die; and once I closed my eyes on this world as I then thought, and as my friends and physicians all expected for the last time. I now say in the presence of that God whom I worship and adore, in whose goodness I trust, and in whose mercies I hope for life and immortality, that in the midst of all my sickness, and in what I thought the HOUR OF DEATH I have never DISTRUSTED His goodness or DOUBTED His mercy, nor did ever an expression of doubt or fear escape my lips, to the truth of which numerous friends can testify—yea, and enemies too, for during a severe illness while in Vermont, some dear people members of the Presbyterian church had the goodness often to watch with me, under the full persuasion that I would renounce the sentiment before I died, but they were convinced at last, as they expressly declared, that if I died I must die a *Universalist*. I really pity Mr. S. that he should have had the weakness to tell such a base story, and that too, when he was standing before people as a messenger of Him in whose mouth there was no guile, and considered himself, or would be considered as delivering a message from God. But supposing I had had those doubts and had called upon this "Gospel Minister" to pray for me, what would this have proved more than the weakness of my mind. Thousands have died in the full belief that God was good to all, and would save all his dependent offspring, and have gone rejoicing in the hope of eternal life. But if the triumphant death of a person, in the belief of a doctrine is proof of the truth of that doctrine, then there is no false doctrine in the world, and on the other hand, if the doubts and fears of a person in the trying hour of death, are proof of the falsity of a doctrine then is there no true doctrine in the world, as some persons, of every religious sentiment, have had their doubts. With respect to the story I say in few

words, I have never had those doubts, but in all my sickness have had the supporting kindness of my God, and have felt more of heaven, and real joy in my heart in those moments I believed to be my last than I have ever experienced in days of health.

R. CARRIQUE.

The following dialogue lately took place, in the western part of the State of New-York, between a Universalist preacher and one of those pious indigent young men, a charity scholar, who was about to enter into the labors of the ministry. The Universalist called at the house of a friend, where he found two of these gentlemen beneficiaries. After being introduced by the master of the house, one, whom we will designate by the term Calvinist, in a very pompous manner, commenced the discourse.

C. (Addressing the Universalist,) Well sir, and what do you think of this great work of the Lord, (alluding to a revival in the neighborhood.)

U. What do I think of the work of the Lord Sir; I reverence and admire the work of the Lord displayed in the system of nature. There I behold his power and God-head, discover the infinitude of divine wisdom, and contemplate with wonder and admiration the goodness of God which beautifies and adorns the whole. In the works of providence I view with feelings of gratitude, a parent's love in providing for his offspring, and supplying, with unbounded liberality, the wants of all animated beings that are dependent on his bounty. In the system of redeeming grace I adore that work of the Lord which delivers the captive long confined in chains of sin, liberates the soul from bondage and brings man to the knowledge and enjoyment of his God and Saviour. I think, sir, that the work of the Lord is not limited or confined, his power is displayed in all the revolving spheres which float throughout the vast immensity of space; His wisdom is infinite in the most extended sense of the word; and his love is universal embracing all worlds and beings which He has made.

C. I find sir that you are a Universalist, and therefore call upon you to repent and renounce that damnable doctrine.

U. Before you call upon me to repent and renounce this doctrine, it is necessary you should prove to me, that the doctrine is false. Are you willing, sir, to enter into a discussion of the subject and attempt by argument drawn from scripture and reason to convince me I am in an error.

C. No sir, I do not wish to converse with Universalists, there are no men of piety or religion among them, they never pray, they do not believe in the necessity of repentance.

U. You mistake sir, they do pray, most sincerely and fervently, and believe in repentance.

C. Yes, yes, I have often heard Universalists say they prayed but never heard one, I do not believe they ever pray. Will you pray Sir?

U. Yes sir, if you will call the family together, I will pray with and for you. And more Sir I will pray in faith, nothing doubting. Will you invite the family to attend?

C. No sir, I do not want to hear a Universalist pray. I know they cannot pray, what have they got to pray for.

U. Well sir, if you will not suffer me to pray, will you have the goodness to pray sir,—will you pray for me, and pray in faith nothing doubting, that God would convince me if in an error, and strengthen me if in the truth. Come sir, will you pray.

C. No, I won't. I do not wish to have any thing to say, or do with Universalists, and I will not stay any longer with you. (With this he abruptly left the house.)

U. (Following him to the door.) Well sir, if you will neither converse with me, nor pray for me, I have one word to say to you. You asked me what I thought of the work

of the Lord. I will tell you,—I think that the wisdom of the Lord, is very apparent in his work this morning in suffering you to show your weakness, and the spirit of the doctrine by which you are influenced, which forbids your attempting to convince me if in an error, or to pray for me if I stand in need of salvation. It is very evident sir, that God has sent you strong delusions that you may believe a lie and be damned, being disobedient to the truth and having pleasure in unrighteousness, which is evident in your charging Universalists with what they are not guilty of, and grossly misrepresenting them. Although you cannot pray for me, yet I can pray for you, and will pray for you, that God will be pleased to open your eyes, deliver you from the delusions you are now under, and enable you to pray for your fellow men in faith nothing doubting.

Bernardston, Sept. 29, 1823.

#### FRANKLIN ASSOCIATION.

The Franklin Association of Universalists convened at Br. Greenleaf's, in Whitingham, Vt. agreeable to adjournment, on Wednesday the 24th of Sept. inst.

Present, Brs. Hosea Ballou, David Ballou, Hollis Sampson, John Brooks, Hosea Ballou, 2d, and Hubbard H. Winchester. Prayer by Br. J. Brooks.—Organized the association by choosing Br. David Ballou, Moderator, and Br. John Brooks, Clerk.

Three sermons were preached by Brs. J. Brooks, H. Ballou, and H. Ballou, 2d.

The association adjourned to meet at Bernardston, Mass. on the 3d Wednesday in Oct. 1824.

*From the (Canandaigua) Plain Truth.*

#### A TOUCH OF THE TERRIBLE!!

*Extract of a letter to the Editors, from Providence, (R. I.)*

"I send you a few eloquent expressions of the Rev. Mr. L.—of this town—which were delivered in a speech to the Female Society. After displaying all his zeal in order to convince his audience that it was their indispensable duty to give their money, he concluded as follows—'And my friends if you leave this house without contributing your mite you need not think of saving your money thereby, for the Lord will have it some way or another. If you do not give it voluntarily he will *burn your houses*, *destroy your shipping and merchandize*, and *blast your hopes forever*.'—[If any one doubts the authenticity of the above extract, he can be satisfied by the original letter now on file in this office. This letter contains the priest's name, and the writers name written in full length.]—*Eds. P. T.*

#### MARRIED.

At East-Hartford, CAPT. STEPHEN COLLINS, of this city, to MRS. RACHEL JONES.

#### DIED.

In Boston, (Mass.) on the 7th instant MISS MARIA S. WILLIAMS, aged 15 years, daughter of Mr. John Williams of this City. Thus cut down in the morning of life, a sweet and lovely flower falls into an early tomb. But while friends mourn their loss, and while those eyes which oft beamed with sweet expressions of love and kindness are filled with tears, thou, dear girl, art enjoying the sweets of eternal rest in the bosom of thy God, who has called thee to himself before the days of sorrow thickened upon thee, and furrowed thy face with anxious sorrows.—Thy seat in Heaven was first prepared, soon we shall follow thee, and meet in that world where we shall no more feel

afflictions dart, the heart bleed in keenest sorrow, or the eyes be dimmed with tears; but all being subdued to Christ, shall live and reign in love, and be forever with their God.

"Hush'd be the sigh, and check'd the tear,  
Tho' nature's claims must be obey'd:  
And tho' that voice no more can cheer,  
Nor lend its lov'd, its willing aid.

The hand that did its being give,  
Has call'd it to the skies;  
Yet in his purpose it shall live,  
Tho' veil'd from mortal eyes.

Then why repine, and grieve my friends;  
Why mourn the spirit fled?  
On wings of love it did ascend  
To him our living head.

'Tis true, that in this dreary waste,  
This wilderness of tears;  
The heart laments its pleasures past,  
It dreads increase of years.

For in the grave all sorrows cease,  
No care the heart shall know;  
Affliction's child is sure at peace,  
Its tears have ceas'd to flow.

The heart its darling friends shall know,  
Its kindred spirit greet;  
And there our gratitude shall flow,  
In accents soft and sweet!

Then hush the sigh and check the tear,  
No more at fate repine;  
For thou shalt meet thy child so dear,  
And with her ever shine."

R. B.

#### NOTICE.

¶ The second Volume of the Religious Inquirer being nearly brought to a close, the agents for the paper are requested to collect and forward the money that remains due, and subscribers who are in arrears, where there are no agents, are requested immediately to forward payment. In complying with this request, agents and subscribers will confer a favor on the publishers.

#### NEW PUBLICATION.

*Just received, and for sale at this Office.*

A NEW Edition of Griesbach, price *three dollars*.—The Greek & English Testament, (2 vols.) price *four dollars*. The New Testament; being the English only of the Greek and English Testament; translated from the original Greek according to Griesbach; upon the basis of the 4th London edition of the improved Version, with an attempt to further improvement from the translations of Campbell, Wakefield, Scarlett, Macknight, and Thompson.—By ABNER KNEELAND, Minister of the First Independent Church of Christ, called Universalist, in Philadelphia.—*Price one dollar and fifty cents.*

Also—A discourse delivered June 4th at the Installation of Rev. David Pickering, to the Pastoral Charge of the First Universalist Society in Providence, (R. I.) by Rev. JOHN BISBE, JR. of Brookfield, (Mass.) Text Jeremiah, xxiii. 28.

PRINTED BY J. T. BEEBE, SEMI-MONTHLY,  
FOR THE PROPRIETORS.

A FEW RODS SOUTH OF THE LITTLE BRIDGE,  
AT ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM—PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.